

1964

11787

of this Act and of provisions of any laws amended by the first eleven titles of this Act printed pursuant to subsection (a) as each State may request. The Joint Committee shall furnish to the President, for use in any State or States in which the referendum is conducted under section 1305, such number of such copies as the President may request.

"(c) Each State which conducts the referendum is requested to exhibit, in conformity with the laws of such State, at the polling places at which voting in the referendum is conducted such number of the copies of this Act and of provisions of any laws amended by the first eleven titles of this Act printed pursuant to subsection (a) as may be necessary for the information of the persons voting in the referendum.

"SEC. 1307. The form of the question to be presented at the referendum shall be substantially as follows:

"The Congress of the United States has enacted a law known as "The Civil Rights Act of 1964", which is divided into thirteen titles, the last two of which relate to this referendum. This law provides that the first eleven titles shall take effect only if approved by the qualified voters of the several States in this referendum. Indicate by making a cross (X) in the proper square (or by pulling the proper lever) whether you approve or disapprove of these titles.

"Approve_____

"Disapprove_____

[X]

[X]

"SEC. 1308. (a) At the request of the Governor of any State, the Attorney General shall assign agents or employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to such of the polling places in such State as the Governor thereof may designate.

"(b) In any case in which the President deems it necessary or advisable, the Attorney General shall assign agents or employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to such of the polling places in any State as the President may designate.

"(c) It shall be the duty of any agent or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation assigned to any polling place under subsection (a) or (b)

"(1) to observe the conduct of the referendum at such polling place,

"(2) to observe the counting and tabulation of the votes cast in the referendum at such polling place, and

"(3) to submit a report to the Attorney General with respect to the duties imposed on him by paragraphs (1) and (2).

"(d) Each agent or employee of the Federal Bureau of Investigation assigned to any polling place under subsection (a) or (b) shall be given access to such polling place and the place where votes cast in the referendum at such polling place are counted and tabulated in order that he may carry out the duties imposed on him by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c); but no such agent or employee shall interfere in the conduct of the referendum, or of the election in conjunction with which such referendum is held by the State officials, or in the counting and tabulating by such officials of the votes cast in the referendum.

"(e) The Attorney General shall furnish to the Governor of any State in which agents or employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are assigned under subsection (a) or (b) a copy of the reports submitted to him under subsection (c) (3) by the agents or employees assigned in such State.

"(f) The Attorney General is authorized, for the purpose of carrying out the duties imposed on him by subsections (a) and (b), to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, such temporary employees as may be necessary, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, except that the

rate of compensation of such number of such temporary employees as he determines necessary may be fixed at rates not in excess of \$75 per day.

"(g) The Attorney General shall, before January 10, 1965, submit a report to the Congress with respect to the duties imposed on him by this section, which shall contain a summary of the reports submitted to him pursuant to subsection (c) (3).

"SEC. 1309. (a) The Governor of each State which conducts the referendum shall certify the results of the referendum conducted in his State to the President of the Senate before January 10, 1965.

"(b) The President shall certify the results of the referendum conducted in any State or States under section 1305 to the President of the Senate before January 10, 1965.

"SEC. 1310. (a) The Senate and the House of Representatives shall assemble in a joint meeting in the Hall of the House of Representatives on January 15, 1965 (or as soon thereafter as possible), at which the certificates from the Governors of the States, and from the President, shall be opened, read, and the results thereof tabulated. The President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, acting jointly, shall declare the results of the referendum.

"(b) If a majority of the votes cast in the referendum approve of the first eleven titles of this Act, such titles shall become effective, except with respect to title VII which shall be subject to section 718, on the date on which the declaration of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives is made.

"(c) If a majority of the votes cast in the referendum disapprove of the first eleven titles of this Act, such titles shall not become effective.

"SEC. 1311. Each State which conducts the referendum may, through its proper State officer, request reimbursement of the expenses incurred by it in conducting the referendum by submitting a statement of such expenses to the chairman of the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Such requests shall be reviewed and allowed by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives, acting jointly, and shall be certified by the chairman of the two committees, acting jointly, to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of moneys appropriated therefor pursuant to section 1312.

"SEC. 1312. There are authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums as may be necessary to enable him to carry out the duties and functions imposed on him by section 1305. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Joint Committee on Printing such sums as may be necessary to enable it to carry out the provisions of section 1306, including such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Government Printing Office for expenses incurred by it under such sections. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General such sums as may be necessary to enable him to carry out the provisions of section 1308. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the States pursuant to section 1311 for expenses incurred in conducting the referendum."

NOTICE OF MEETING OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is a cosponsor of the bill S. 750, has a speaking engagement in his home State which, if he keeps it, will make it im-

possible for him to be at our committee meeting in Washington, at 8:30 next Monday morning, and in view of the fact that other members of the committee find it quite inconvenient to be present at that time, I announce that the meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee scheduled for 8:30 a.m. Monday, June 1, to consider S. 750, has been postponed to Wednesday, June 3, at 10 o'clock a.m.

In addition to S. 750, the truth in lending bill, the committee will consider the resolution of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], House Joint Resolution 889, relating to a galvano for the Pensacola Naval Air Station; the forest tract bill, S. 2259 and H.R. 8230; and the credit union bill, H.R. 8459.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry to be so obtuse and to display my ignorance in public, but pray tell, what is a galvano?

Mr. ROBERTSON. A galvano is an emblem, somewhat bigger than the clock on the wall, but smaller than the eagles around it. It will be made and hung up in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the great Naval Air Station at Pensacola, Fla. It is not made of gold or any other precious metal, but it will be designed by an expert designer at the mint and it will have an appropriate design to honor the Naval Air Station. The two Senators from Florida would like to make the proposed small tribute. The people in Florida will pay all the expenses.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So it is bigger than a dime—

Mr. ROBERTSON. It is bigger than a dime.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And it is smaller than the moon coming up over Virginia Beach.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator is correct.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 28, 1964, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 538) for the relief of Henry Bang Williams.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 538) for the relief of Henry Bang Williams, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Text of citation presented the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON together with his remarks to American War Mothers on May 10 at Arlington National Cemetery.

May 28

By Mr. KEATING:

On behalf of Mr. Scott, statement and articles on centennial birthday of Father Joseph Murgas observed by Slovak-Americans.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Oration entitled "An American Citizen's Rights and Responsibilities Under the Constitution," by Don Burnett, of Pocatello, Idaho, delivered in the American Legion's National High School Oratorical Contest.

OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a column by Walter Lippmann in the Washington Post of this morning, entitled "Our Commitment in Vietnam."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM

(By Walter Lippmann)

It is fair enough to say, as Senator DIRKSEN did this week, that our policy in southeast Asia has been indecisive. Indeed it has been. The reason for this indecision, which has existed under three Presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson, is not that all three Presidents have been weak and wavering men. It is that since we allowed ourselves to become entangled in southeast Asia, there has been no good solution available which any of the three Presidents felt he could be decisive about.

After the French were defeated in 1954, our cardinal mistake in southeast Asia was the decision of Secretary Dulles to treat South Vietnam, which is an artificial creation and not really a national state at all, as an American protectorate and as an outpost of the West. The Eisenhower administration, directed in this matter by Secretary Dulles, did not oppose, but it refused to support, the settlement of Vietnam which was worked out at the first Geneva conference in 1954. The U.S. Government helped to pick Diem as chief of South Vietnam and, until the coup of last autumn, Diem and his family were supported by us as the rulers of South Vietnam and they became the clients of the United States.

This put us in an inherently untenable position. It committed the United States to a struggle on the land and in the jungles near the frontiers of the largest nation in Asia. In spite of the endless official assurances of how the struggle was being won, there has never been a time when a military victory, or anything like a military victory, has been possible. Even if one of the Presidents had been willing to intervene with an American army on the scale of Korea, even if he had unleashed the Air Force, no acceptable or tolerable outcome was visible. For once the American troops were engaged, there would be no way of withdrawing. The territory they had occupied would be reoccupied by the Asian multitude who would be more fiercely determined than ever to do away with the presence of the Western white man.

There has never been any other way out of the dead-end street in southeast Asia except to make a political agreement, to construct international machinery, and to exert what influence we can by underwriting them. President Kennedy made a fragmentary attempt to do this. He tried it in Laos, but he allowed himself to remain entangled in South Vietnam, and he was drawn into an ever enlarging, continually unsuccessful, military struggle which has no visible end.

To those who think, as I do, that the military commitment in southeast Asia has been a mistake, the question now is how to dis-

charge the commitment honorably and to disengage safely. The basic principle is, I think, quite clear. We must look for a solution, not by expanding the war but, by taking it to the conference table, whether to a reconvened Geneva conference or to the United Nations or both. The proposal to expand the war by bombing North Vietnam and China requires, if we stop pretending that the South Vietnamese pilots are capable of carrying out such an attack, a declaration of war against North Vietnam and China by the Congress of the United States. We cannot make war on North Vietnam by Executive order.

No man living can possibly know what such a war would precipitate, or what the Soviet Union would do since it is still the ally of China. But what we can be sure of is that to go to war with China about South Vietnam would be so reckless an act as to damage deeply our influence throughout the world. It would be no less unpopular in the United States.

It is not easy for any country to repair its mistakes, especially those in which it has invested lives, money, and moral judgments. But the original mistake in southeast Asia has to be repaired. The way to do this is to go to a conference. The chances of its being successful are not brilliant. But at least we shall not be alone and, even if the prospects of a conference are not brilliant, the military outlook in South Vietnam is dismal beyond words.

I have been asked whether a negotiated settlement for southeast Asia means that as soon as our troops are withdrawn from Saigon, the North Vietnamese and the Chinese will move in. The honest answer to this question is, I believe, that if this can be prevented for a few years, then there will be a chance that it will not happen at all.

Although I realize that in the long run southeast Asia is bound to lie within the Chinese sphere of influence—as Chiang Kai-shek has always insisted—I think it may be possible to prevent any sudden and overt occupation of southeast Asia. It may be feasible to make it too dangerous, and not worthwhile in comparison with the prospects of access to the economic resources of southeast Asia and beyond.

I think, moreover, that if an international structure can be created, one which is guaranteed by the Soviet Union, the United States, France, Great Britain, and China, that North Vietnam will tend to go Titoist, that is to say to remain Communist but not Chinese. What will do most for our real interests in southeast Asia is not to bomb Hanoi but to create a visible guarantee which makes it safe for Hanoi not to be, as it has always striven not to be, a Chinese satellite.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as a friend and a great admirer of Walter Lippmann, I have been waiting for a long time—and I am sure he will appreciate this good-natured comment of mine—for him to catch up on his reading. This column shows that he has caught up on his reading. He has found that the research which the Senator from Alaska [Mr. CRUKNING] and the senior Senator from Oregon have done in the field of international law relative to our policy in Vietnam stands up.

In his column this morning, Mr. Lippmann laid out in concise and condensed form the position the Senator from Alaska and the senior Senator from Oregon have taken these many weeks as we have spoken on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the U.S. foreign policy in South Vietnam. We have been pointing out the history of that unfortunate conflict. We have pointed out that it

stems from the great mistake of John Foster Dulles in 1954, when he led the United States away from signing the Geneva accords. In 1954 John Foster Dulles succeeded in pressuring South Vietnam not to sign the Geneva accords, and thereby laid the basis for the great crisis that faces not only the United States, but also the world today in respect to the danger of a nuclear war breaking out in southeast Asia. Such a war will cost us, if it occurs, thousands and thousands of American lives. I wish to quote only one paragraph from this excellent statement of Walter Lippmann in his column today:

After the French were defeated in 1954, our cardinal mistake in southeast Asia was the decision of Secretary Dulles to treat South Vietnam, which is an artificial creation and not really a national state at all, as an American protectorate—

Which I have been saying in speech after speech on the floor of the Senate for weeks—

and as an outpost of the West. The Eisenhower administration directed in this matter by Secretary Dulles, did not oppose, but it refused to support, the settlement of Vietnam which was worked out at the first Geneva Conference in 1954. The U.S. Government helped to pick Diem as the chief of South Vietnam and, until the coup of last autumn, Diem and his family were supported by us as the rulers of South Vietnam and they became the clients of the United States.

Later in the column, this keen writer on American foreign policy raises the United Nations issue, as the senior Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Alaska have done for weeks on the floor of the Senate.

One cannot read the Lippmann column without recognizing that the responsibility and obligation is ours to resort to the rule of law. As Lippmann says "We must look for a solution, not by expanding the war but by taking it to the conference table, whether to a reconvened Geneva conference or to the United Nations or both." Yet Stevenson in his unfortunate speech of last Thursday in the Security Council rejected the conference table and rejected the United Nations except for an inadequate proposal that the United Nations consider maintaining a border patrol along the Cambodia border. I am satisfied that Stevenson knew when he made the border patrol proposal that it was unacceptable. The United States should not resort to such diversionary and face-saving diplomatic tactics.

The only way out of our horrendous mistaken policy in southeast Asia is to resort to the rule of law for a settlement of this unjustifiable war. We are wrong, dead wrong, and the best way to save face is to admit our mistake.

We have just listened to the President of Ireland pay his homage to the abstract principle of the use of the rule of law for the settlement of international disputes. I am pleased to insert in the Record the Lippmann column, for the Lippmann column in its abstract principles and in its specifics sustains the position that the senior Senator from Oregon has taken in regard to the South Vietnam crisis.

1964

Mr. President, this is the last time that I shall have an opportunity to speak on the subject before Memorial Day, but it is appropriate that my comments should be made before Memorial Day. As I have said previously on the floor of the Senate, if the United States does not retrace its steps, if the United States does not abandon the rationalization that we must stay in in order to save face we may well be the cause of a major war in Asia. It will kill thousands and thousands of American boys.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. As I said yesterday, Mr. President, I have heard about throwing out the baby with the bath water, but I have never before heard that we ought to blow off heads to save face. What we are doing is figuratively and literally blowing off the heads of increasing numbers of American boys in an unjustifiable, unconstitutional war in an attempt to save face in Vietnam. In my judgment, we are engaged in an illegal killing of those boys in South Vietnam. Before Memorial Day we ought to go to our knees again and pray to Almighty God that there will be the strength of statesmanship in our Republic to bring to an end the unconscionable war that we are conducting in South Vietnam. We should pray to Almighty God for strength and courage to live up to our obligations under the United Nations Charter by making it clear to all the nations of the world that we are now willing to lay the issue before the United Nations for a determination in accordance with the procedures of that charter. We should keep faith with our obligations, to resort to the rule of law instead of the rule of jungle law for the settlement of the Vietnam crisis. We end the unsound foreign policy the United States is following today of substituting American military might for the right.

That is the call and challenge of statesmanship that faces my Government today. I hope that throughout Memorial Day, as we honor the fallen dead of our military of the past, who saved our Union, we will recognize that we have a moral obligation to see to it that we do not continue to follow a course of action that would lead to an escalation of the war in South Vietnam, which, if it should come about within the 12 months, would result in the sacrifice of tens of thousands of American boys in an unnecessary and unjustifiable war.

INCOME DISCLOSURE BY SENATORS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on May 18 I made a voluntary disclosure of my financial holdings. During those remarks I mentioned, with approval, the names of Senators who had already made personal disclosures of their in-

comes. It has come to my attention that I inadvertently omitted the names of two of my colleagues—GALE McGEE, Democrat, from Wyoming, and FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, from Utah—who have made similar disclosures.

The disclosure of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] was made in a statement which appeared in the April 4, 1963, edition of the Rocky Mountain News of Denver. The Senator noted that his income—and this seems to be a frequent condition of younger Senators—consists of his salary and such honorariums as he receives from speaking engagements outside the Senate. Many of these honorariums were often no more than a plane ticket which would give the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] a chance to stop in Wyoming to discuss problems with constituents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper account of the disclosure statement of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MCGEE REVEALS OUTSIDE FINANCIAL INTERESTS

(By Gene Wortsman)

WASHINGTON, APRIL 3.—Senator GALE W. McGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, Wednesday stood alone among his Wyoming colleagues in complying with a request to make public his outside financial holdings.

McGEE did so with a statement that such revelation is "a demonstration of responsibility toward both (a Congressman's) constituents and the Nation."

The Rocky Mountain News asked the three Congressmen if they would publicize through this newspaper their outside financial interests. U.S. Senators demand that Cabinet appointees not only make their holdings public but dispose of some of them if they would constitute a conflict of interest.

TO WRITE BANK

Senator MILWARD SIMPSON, Republican, of Wyoming, at first said he "will write back to my bank at Cody for my financial statement and release it to you later."

However, Simpson now has declined to do so. A spokesman said he may announce it later.

Representative WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, Republican, of Wyoming, said "when Congress passes a bill (requiring such publication), I will be glad to comply with it."

Otherwise, he added, he did not wish to comment on the request.

McGEE said that since his election to the Senate he has received his salary as a Senator plus "such occasional honorariums as I receive for the limited number of speeches that I make outside the Senate."

HONORARIUMS

"I would add that these honorariums are often travel expenses or less. They enable me to purchase airplane tickets to Wyoming since as a Member of the Senate I am entitled to only two trips a year to my home State. I have found it necessary to locate extra income to pay for the 46 trips made beyond the allowance to Wyoming during the 4 years I have been here in Washington."

"That," McGEE added, "is the sum total of my income. This Member of the Senate obviously is in the position of having no interests to conflict."

McGEE said it is only just that Americans go to great lengths to avoid conflicts of interest in government.

"History has shown that nothing so erodes a citizen's trust and faith in his Government as evidence of graft and corruption."

"And as we in the Congress assume the responsibility for eliminating conflicts of interest in those on the Federal payroll we ourselves should, of course, be similarly free from such conflicts."

"Several Members of the Congress already have made public their financial holdings in the belief that such disclosures contribute to effective public service. I believe that this is indeed a demonstration of responsibility toward both their constituents and the Nation," he declared.

POWER COMPANY PROPAGANDA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, more than 30 years ago, a highly respected editor of the Portland, Maine, Evening News, distilled an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission on the propaganda techniques of the private power companies into a remarkable book, "The Public Pays—A Study of Power Propaganda." Today that editor is the distinguished Senator from Alaska, ERNEST GRUENING, and this month I am pleased to see that his book has been updated and reissued under the title, "The Public Pays—and Still Pays."

If the book were addressed to the contemporary scene, it would contain a whole chapter on the current campaign of the Idaho Power Co. and the Utah Power & Light Co. to block the construction of a public transmission line into southern Idaho.

Massive injections of propaganda are being administered to the people of Idaho. They are being told that the Bonneville Power Administration, despite its proven benefit to every other part of the Northwest, is a system of sinister socialism. The private power monopoly in southern Idaho, despite its high rates and total lack of competition, is euphemistically described as "free enterprise." The people are warned that their schools and local governments will soon be deprived of tax support from the utility companies if the BPA transmission line is built, even though private utility companies have flourished and grown elsewhere in the Northwest in areas long served by Bonneville power.

We ask nothing more than equal treatment for southern Idaho, which is part of the Columbia-Snake River Basin, and entitled to the same benefit from the Federal system as flows to every other part of the basin. This is why the Johnson administration seeks a \$1 million appropriation in this year's budget to initiate planning and designs for a BPA transmission line into southern Idaho, if the private companies continue to refuse to wheel the power. What is asked is plain justice.

Yet, to make it appear some kind of dangerous conspiracy, power company spokesmen in Idaho have talked to nearly every service club, handbills have been distributed door to door, a massive advertising campaign has been waged in the newspapers and over the air, and immense pressures are being brought to bear in Congress.

The very lobby, the beginnings of which the Senator from Alaska [Mr.

May 28

GRUENING describes so well in his book, is now focused on preventing Justice from being done in southern Idaho. So I commend Senator GRUENING's book to my colleagues. Those who cannot remember the twenties and thirties will learn from it that today's power propaganda is but a more expensive and elaborate version of what has gone before.

Mr. President, I ask that an excellent commentary by Ron Ross on Senator GRUENING's book, "The Public Pays—And Still Pays" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW EDITION OF SENATOR GRUENING'S STUDY OF POWER PROPAGANDA SHOWS "THE PUBLIC STILL PAYS"

(By Ron Ross)

More than 30 years ago, a well-known editor and writer distilled the massive hearings of the Federal Trade Commission's investigation of power company propaganda into a concise, readable volume entitled, "The Public Pays—A Study of Power Propaganda."

The author, ERNEST GRUENING, later entered into a distinguished career of public service, and now is a U.S. Senator from Alaska. The book, long out of print, is being reissued this month—not because of Senator GRUENING's position or the undoubted historic merit of the book, but because, as the cover of the new paperback edition notes: "The Public Pays—And Still Pays."

Although originally published in 1931, 3 years before the Federal Trade Commission issued the summary report to its investigation of the companies' propaganda campaigns of the twenties, "The Public Pays" concerns a menace perhaps more threatening in 1964.

Today's power company propagandists have the benefits of some 30 more years of research into how to mold public opinion. And they have new methods of influencing the public. The book recalls how the shocked Judge Robert E. Healey, counsel for FTC at the hearings, asked the National Electric Light Association's director of public information whether the companies had neglected any form of publicity in their efforts to win favor for the companies. The answer was, "Only one and that is sky-writing."

But back in the twenties, the full potential of radio broadcasting had not been realized, and TV was a laboratory dream. Recently it was reported that the electric companies' advertising program (ECAP) was studying a plan for power company sponsorship of a multimillion-dollar TV series based on the life of the late Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Such ventures make it clear that the public not only is "still paying," but is paying sums undreamed of by even the most ambitious of the comparatively primitive power company public relations experts of the twenties.

In an introduction of the new edition of "The Public Pays," Senator GRUENING writes that the book is being reissued "to remind the American people about the proverb of the leopard and his unchangeable spots; to recall to them the immortal dictum of our forefathers that 'eternal vigilance is the price of liberty'; and to point out that 'The Public Still Pays.'"

To illustrate his point, Senator GRUENING had added reproductions of nine ECAP advertisements, including the infamous Berlin Wall ad. This ad published just a year ago was assailed as "a particularly ugly advertising campaign" by the late President Kennedy.

Other ECAP ads include one featuring baby pictures from several years ago, and the one showing a youngster with a Bible, key, pencil and ballot—seeking to equate private power with "symbols of freedom."

Also added to the new edition is the text of the February 1941, opinion (No. 59) of the Federal Power Commission, under the chairmanship of the late Leland Olds, describing the political activities of Northwest power companies in fighting local public power. Of more than \$1 million expended by the companies between 1935 and 1940 for "political and legislative interests and to influence public opinion," half was charged to the companies' consumers.

But the main substance of the book is the original text of the study of the electric power companies' efforts to control public opinion. The story begins with the proposal in 1927 of the late Senator Thomas J. Walsh, of Montana, for an investigation of the electric utility industry, and how opponents of the investigation, led by the late Senator Walter F. George of Georgia, succeeded in diverting the investigation to the Federal Trade Commission, where it was assumed it would largely wither.

Credit for starting the companies' massive efforts to curry favor is given to Samuel Insull, who in 1919 ordered the creation of an "Illinois Committee on Public Utility Information." This was "the progenitor of a nationwide movement."

"Although it deals with propaganda," wrote author GRUENING in the introduction to the first edition, "this volume is not propaganda on either side of the controversial issue involved—as that issue was envisaged by the strategists in the power propaganda campaign. The material is as far as possible extracted verbatim from the Federal Trade Commission's reports and exhibits, so that the propaganda's purpose, as nearly as may be, is revealed 'out of the mouths' of its proponents."

In the following chapters, the words of the "proponents" are frequently used to spell out how the power companies sought to corrupt education, win the support of women and children, control the press and even bar Chautauqua platforms to public ownership advocates.

Chapters on the power company campaign in the universities and colleges may seem remote, but are they? It was less than 2 years ago—not in the twenties—that a Columbia University press release referred to "the continuous inroads of the tax-free public ownership" in promoting a utility management workshop.

Just last month, the American Power Conference, held in Chicago under the sponsorship of the Illinois Institute of Technology in association with leading universities, provided, as it frequently has in the past, a forum for power company spokesmen to attack public power.

Many of the techniques employed by the power companies in the twenties will be familiar to those who have opposed the contemporary company propagandists. Nor have the names even changed in all cases.

The first edition of this book reported on the Federal Trade Commission's disclosure of the "canned" editorial propaganda mill operated by E. Hofer & Sons. Free editorials were provided to newspapers by the service which was financed by the privately owned electric utilities and other industries. And they still are, as Senator GRUENING notes in his new introduction.

"Although exposed 30 years ago by the Federal Trade Commission, the practice of thus subverting public opinion continues," he comments, quoting the text of a recent Hofer editorial to demonstrate "the similarity in the line taken by the Hofer editorial and the contemporary advertising of the utility companies."

"The Public Pays" shows that in the twenties, as today, the company propagandists were seeking to discredit municipal electric utilities. And, then as now, they were frustrated by successful operations.

"The sad part of the story is that it is true," wrote a spokesman for the companies' Oklahoma Utilities Information Committee in 1927 to a colleague in New England when asked about a story praising the Ponca City municipal system which had appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

Similarly, a Michigan leader reported, "The less said about Holland the better," when asked about the Holland, Mich., system. "It is a successful municipally owned plant, and there is no use denying the fact."

A Missouri propagandist complained of the low rates of the Hannibal, Mo., system and advised a coworker, "It is extremely desirable that the Hannibal plant should be removed from the field of comparison in Missouri." And an Illinois committee official confidentially reported the failure of efforts to find discrepancies in the accounts of the Springfield system.

The title, "The Public Pays," no doubt came from the advice given a public relations section of the National Electric Light Association by the association's managing director, the late M. H. Aylesworth, in 1924: "Don't be afraid of the expense. The public pays the expenses."

That was 40 years ago, but as Senator GRUENING points out, the public is still paying. And it's likely that the public will continue to pay for its own brainwashing until it awakens to the facts about this long, continuing propaganda war of the companies.

Widespread distribution of this timely new edition of Senator GRUENING's book can make an important contribution to this awakening.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S DOUBLE STANDARD IN THE MIDDLE EAST IS SHOWING

MR. KEATING. Mr. President, in what I consider a shocking display of determined wrongheadedness, the Department of State has rammed through the International Monetary Fund a massive loan to Egypt. In complete violation of standard and very important monetary fund regulations, Nasser is to receive a \$40 million loan even though his government has not undertaken the internal reform and austerity measures which the IMF requires.

Mr. President, this loan is in every way contrary to the best interests of the United States. It will undermine the effectiveness of IMF pressure for financial reform throughout the world. It will weaken American influence among our European allies who strongly oppose such favoritism to the government of President Nasser. It will undermine support for the Alliance for Progress and other aid programs in which assistance is conditioned on financial reform.

Most conspicuously, Mr. President, this action on the part of our own State Department which I understand was opposed by Treasury Department officials, brings out into the open the double standard which our Government is applying to Middle Eastern problems. President Nasser has just exhibited during Khrushchev's tour of Egypt his complete disregard for the objectives which we seek in the Middle East. He has blatantly revealed that he will take funds and support from any nation that will enable him to pursue his own objectives of Arab imperialism and aggression against Israel. Economic development